



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District
3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

VOICE 410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-3042

October Minutes

Thursday, October 7, 2021; 7:00 p.m.

A public meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, October 7, 2021. To adhere to social distancing measures, the meeting was not held at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, but was conducted as a virtual web meeting/conference call.

Ms. Zoren moved to approve the September 2, 2021 minutes. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Bruno Reich; Erica Zoren; Julianne Danna, Ellen Flynn Giles, Dustin Thacker

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Kristen Haskins

This Agenda identifies the work proposed and includes comments and recommendations from DPZ Staff. The recommendations included here do not constitute a decision of the Commission.

PLAN FOR APPROVAL

Regular Agenda

1. HPC-21-34 – 13883 Triadelphia Road, Glenelg
2. HPC-21-38 – 8085 Main Street, 8095 Main Street, 8109-8111 Main Street, 8113 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. HPC-21-39 – 8081 Main Street, 8085 Main Street, 8095 Main Street, 8109-8111 Main Street, 8113 Main Street and 8125 Main Street, 3760 St. Paul Street, Ellicott City

OTHER BUSINESS

1. New Commission members introduction
2. Commission officer voting
3. Administrative updates and information

REGULAR AGENDA

HPC-21-34 – 13883 Triadelphia Road, Glenelg

Applicant: Nasser Nasseri

Request: The Applicant, Nasser Nasseri, requests Advisory Comments on the demolition and new construction at 13883 Triadelphia Road, Glenelg.

Background and Site Description: This property is not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory and is not located in a local historic district. However, the building is historic. According to SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1900.

The property consists of 6.95 acres and one buildable lot.

The County Architectural Historian provided the following information:

“This small farm was part of a 55-acre tract that Josephus Isaac purchased in 1833 for only \$390, the low price suggesting that it had no significant improvements at that time. The house Isaac built for himself may still exist as part of 3866 Ivory Road (HO-895). The Isaacs parcel was subdivided a number of times for the children of Josephus, which complicates the understanding of each property, but this portion of the land was willed to his grandson George H. Isaac in 1875. The house has features that suggest it was built in the 1850s, but also has some conservative features that could put it back to the 1830s. It has a side-passage plan with only one room in the main block and must have had a kitchen ell that was taken down and replaced with the existing larger two-story ell. The Isaac family sold the 16-acre farm to John Akers for \$1,750 in 1903. It is possible that the Isaacs enlarged the house in the late-nineteenth century but perhaps more likely that Akers was responsible for the existing rear ell. However, John and his wife Honor were in their 40s when they bought the farm and had no children and apparently no live-in help, so they did not need the space. The cross gable on the front is almost certainly from the twentieth century and must have been added by Akers. In most cases the cross gable is added to the older roof, but in this instance the entire roof was replaced and suggests the possibility that the old roof was destroyed in a storm. A one-story addition was built onto the back of the ell in the 1920s or 1930s. The farm was purchased by Joseph and Mary Mullinex in 1937 so they are the ones most likely for these improvements.”

Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to demolish all existing structures, including the historic house and a barn and construct a new principle dwelling. In addition to the barn, there are ruins of a few outbuildings around the property. All of these structures will be demolished.



Figure 1 - Building located at 13883 Triadelphia Road.



Figure 2 - Vergeboard details and arched window.



Figure 3 - Outbuilding to be demolished.



Figure 4 - Outbuilding to be demolished.



Figure 5 - Outbuilding to be demolished.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Section 16.118. - Protection of Historic Resources

The structure is not located in a historic district and is not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory, so Section 16.118 of the subdivision regulations for the Protection of Historic Resources does not apply.

The County Architectural Historian has documented and measured the building, in order to create measured drawings and inventory the building, which will be added to the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties.

The exterior front gable components (vergeboard, shingles and arched window) and porch posts have retained their character and should be salvaged.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC provide Advisory Comments on the demolition and new construction.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Nasser Nasser, the Applicant and Lisa Jensen Wingate, who spoke against the application. Mr. Nasser had no further information to provide. Ms. Wingate was glad to hear the

buildings were documented, but was not happy to hear that the building and outbuildings were going to be demolished. Ms. Wingate offered recommendations for preserving the façade and adding onto the rear in order to preserve the structure.

Mr. Reich agreed with Ms. Wingate's comments. He said there was an opportunity to incorporate the house into the new structure, as the structure looked in good condition, could be resided and the interiors redone. He said an addition could be added to complement the historic building, and still provide more space. He said the house is a standard Howard County farmhouse that could be adapted to many other things. He said in building a new house, they will have to do sediment and erosion control, landscaping, many things adding a lot money in new construction, but many of those requirements go away when renovating and adding on to the existing house. He said that solution would save an important part of Howard County history.

Ms. Zoren agreed with Mr. Reich and Ms. Wingate's comments. She said it would be a great opportunity to retain the rural characteristic of Howard County, particularly the older farmhouses. She said that as an architect, she knows the farmhouse look is in demand right now, with more modern elements added. She recalled a recent project in Clarksville, where the owners added an additional 3,000 square feet and new garage and explained there is the opportunity to get permits for an addition and make it a unique house. She asked the Applicant to consider keeping and renovating the house.

Ms. Danna agreed with the previous statements. She said after doing a site visit, the house appeared to be in good condition and that it would be a shame to lose something with a lot of detail and architectural characteristics. She agreed that the farmhouse look was in fashion right now and could be updated. She hoped the Applicant would consider saving it.

Ms. Flynn Giles echoed the sentiments of the previous Commission members. She said the architectural element should also be salvaged and incorporated into the new structure as well.

Mr. Thacker did not have any comments.

Mr. Shad agreed with the previous comments made and asked the Applicant to consider other options. He said the Applicant should salvage materials, and if they will not use them, they could donate them to Second Chance or similar places.

Mr. Nasser said he bought the house and fell in love with it and wanted to incorporate it into the new house. He said the new house will be 14,000 to 16,000 square feet and he is unable to add an addition of that size to the house. He said they will incorporate items into the new house as much as possible.

HPC-21-38 – 8085 Main Street, 8095 Main Street, 8109-8111 Main Street, 8113 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Robert Z. Hollenbeck, Howard County Department of Public Works

Request: The Applicant, Robert Z. Hollenbeck, AIA, on behalf of the Howard County Department of Public Works, requests a Certificate of Approval for the partial demolition of the portions of the building located over the stream channel at 8085 Main Street, 8095 Main Street, 8109-8111 Main Street and 8113 Main Street.

While the Applicant has submitted one application for all four buildings (and 8109-8111 and 8113 Main Street are treated as one building as they are the same tax account ID/map and parcel), this report will address each building separately, under different case numbers:

- 1) HPC-21-38a – 8085 Main Street (commonly known as Portalli’s building)
- 2) HPC-21-38b – 8095 Main Street (commonly known as Shoemaker’s/historically known as the Rosenstock building)
- 3) HPC-21-38c – 8109-8111 (commonly known as the Johnson’s three-story building)
- 4) HPC-21-38d – 8113 Main Street (commonly known as the Johnson’s two-story building)

Background and Site Description: The Applicant previously came before the Commission with applications for Advisory Comments and Certificates of Approval, as related to the Ellicott City Safe and Sound Plan and the removal of the rear of buildings over the stream and/or restoration of the portions of the buildings to remain. This report will reference various Addendums to the Staff Report as related to those previous meetings, historical information or other related HPC cases. A full list of the Addendums, incorporated into the record by reference, includes:

Addendum 1 - Minutes HPC-18-46, September 2018

- Howard County Government, under a previous administration received Advisory Comments for the proposed demolition of 10 buildings on lower Main Street.

Addendum 2 – Minutes HDC-00-04; 8085 Main Street, Ellicott City; February 2000

- The application was for the repair of the building after the November 1999 fire caused significant damage. The minutes state that HPC staff said, “Mr. Bockmiller stated that the November fire essentially gutted this building. He said the roof is missing and the second floor of the rear addition was condemned and had to be removed. He stated that the building itself is essentially sound but in need of restoration from the fire damage. The roof would be reconstructed and the second-floor rear addition would be replaced, constructed in-kind, with siding to match existing. Mr. Bockmiller said that window and door arrangements on the reconstructed addition would be somewhat altered from the previous arrangement. A new wooden stairway would be constructed on the rear and two existing stoops in the rear yard area would be repaired.”

Addendum 3 – Minutes HPC-16-101; 8085 Main Street, Ellicott City; November 2016

- The work applied for and approved in this application was for repairs after the 2016 flood and consisted of:
 - Removing the existing steel beam supporting the wood joist floor framing system that spans the Tiber River and replacing it with a structural poured in place concrete beam/floor decking system. The original floor joist system was compromised by two fires and the flood and was no longer safe.

- Replacing wood framed walls on the sides of the building, which are located over the river, with structural concrete block walls to support the second floor and to assist with flood control.
- Repair and alterations to the damage front façade.

Addendum 4 – Minutes HPC-19-28; 8085 Main Street, Ellicott City; June 2019

- Upon acquiring the building, Howard County DPW made repairs to the front façade, making needed façade repairs due to the 2018 flood, and fixing incorrectly made repairs from the 2016 flood.

Addendum 5 – Minutes HDC-00-11 – 8095 Main Street, Ellicott City; March 2000

- This case was for the construction of a new building to replace the demolished historic Rosenstock Department Store, which was destroyed in the November 1999 fire. The minutes state, “that the applicant proposed to construct a new retail building in the footprint of the structure that was destroyed in the November 1999 fire. He said the building would be 3 stories tall, and eight bays wide. The first floor would contain a central double entry door and a continuous bank of display windows with square pattern grilles in the top 40 percent of the windows.”

Addendum 6 – Minutes, HPC-17-23, 8109-8113 Main Street, April 2017 (repairs from 2016 flood)

- This application was to make repairs to the buildings (8109-8111 and 8113) as result of the 2016 flood. The staff report noted that there was no evidence of historic elements in the apartment units (which were located upstairs and across the river). The first-floor retail space, which spanned the stream, was destroyed and no features remained except for the historic trusses.

Addendum 7 – Minutes HPC-19-18; 8125 Main Street, Ellicott City; May 2, 2019

- While this property is not part of the current application, the Applicant received a Certificate of Approval for the partial demolition of damaged portions of the rear of the building, and the temporary stabilization of the remaining portion. The scope of work included removal of the portion of the building directly over the stream channel and four possible scenarios for stabilization of the remaining structure. The Commission unanimously voted to approve the proposal as submitted on the basis that this was a Structure of Unusual Importance due to its contribution to the Main Street façade and the work proposed preserved the value of the structure by removing damaged elements in danger of collapse and by removing damaged parts of the structure that threatened the structure as a whole.

Addendum 8 – Minutes HPC-19-48; Ellicott City Safe and Sound Plan; October 3, 2019

- The Applicant presented a detailed overview of the Ellicott City Safe and Sound Plan, flood mitigation projects, Section 106 process, Ellicott City Watershed Master Plan involvement and received Advisory Comments from the Commission. The Applicant explained the County Executive selected Option 3G.7.0 for flood mitigation, which included the removal of four buildings (8049 Main Street, 8055 Main Street, 8059 Main Street and 8069 Main Street) and the stabilization of six buildings, to include the removal of the portions of those buildings located over the stream channel (8081 Main Street, 8085 Main Street, 8059 Main Street, 8111 Main Street, 8113 Main Street and 8125 Main Street).

Addendum 9 – Minutes HPC-20-15; 8125 Main Street, Ellicott City, May 7, 2020

- While this property is not part of the current application, the Applicant presented six possible restoration and flood proofing options for the front façade of the building, in order to protect the portion of the building remaining along Main Street and preserve the character of the

building. The Commission provided Advisory Comments/Pre-Application Advice on the proposals.

Addendum 10 – Minutes HPC-20-74; 8049 Main Street, 8055 Main Street, 8059 Main Street, 8061 Main Street, 8069 Main Street, vicinity of 3711 Maryland Avenue, Ellicott City, October 1, 2020

- The Applicant received Advisory Comments/Pre-Application Advice on the Maryland Avenue Culvert Project (including the removal of four buildings), at 8049, 8055, 8059, 8061 and 8069 Main Street, Vicinity/East of 3711 Maryland Avenue, Ellicott City, associated with the Ellicott City Safe and Sound plan. The application explained “that the flood mitigation projects work together as a system to collectively mitigate flash flooding, and that “in order to be most effectively implemented, significant constrictions in the conveyance system need to be alleviated. The Maryland Avenue Culvert project will provide significant additional stormwater conveyance from the Tiber/Hudson Branch to the Patapsco River, while mitigating a significant constriction to water flow.”

Addendum 11 – Decision and Order, HPC-20-83

- The Applicant submitted an application for Certificate of Approval to demolish the buildings and bridge at 8049 Main Street, 8055 Main Street, 8059 Main Street, 8061 Main Street and 8069 Main Street, and construct the expanded terraced floodplain/culvert. The expanded terraced floodplain/culvert will utilize the stone from the existing stream walls and stone salvaged from the building demolition. The weir wall will be constructed using salvaged stone from Ellicott City. The imbricated stone spillway will also be constructed with stone. The application was approved, with amendments and conditions.

Addendum 12 – 8085 Main Street Photos

Addendum 13 – 8095 Main Street Photos

Addendum 14 – 8109-8111, 8113 Main Street Photos

Addendum 15 – 8109-8111, 8113 Main Street Draft Inventory Updates

Addendum 16 – 8109-8111 Main Street, HO-586 Inventory Form

Addendum 17 – 8113 Main Street, HO-359 Inventory Form

These properties are all located in the Ellicott City Historic District (HO-78). The buildings have the following dates of construction and alteration:

- 1) 8085 Main Street (Portalli’s) – SDAT dates the building to 1920.
 - a. The building was significantly damaged in the 1999 fire, 2016 flood and 2018 flood.
- 2) 8095 Main Street – The historic building was destroyed in the 1999 fire and demolished, the current building constructed in 2000.
- 3) 8109-8111 Main Street – The building at 8109-8111 Main Street dates circa 1860 and is shown on the Sanborn maps by 1887. The property is listed as HO-586, Katydid, in the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory and the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties.
 - a. Photographic evidence shows the front façade has been altered significantly over time.
 - b. The building was damaged in the 1999 fire and sustained significant interior and exterior damage in the 2016 and 2018 floods.
- 4) 8113 Main Street – The building dates circa 1830s. The property is listed as HO-359, Crosscurrents/Caplan’s Frame Shop, in the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory and the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties.
 - a. Photographic evidence shows the front façade has been altered significantly over time.
 - b. The building was damaged in the 1999 fire and sustained significant interior and exterior damage in the 2016 and 2018 floods.

Scope of Work: The Department of Public Works requests a Certificate of Approval for the partial demolition of the portions of the building located over the stream channel at:

- 1) 8085 Main Street, Ellicott City (HPC-21-38a) – Portalli’s building
- 2) 8095 Main Street, Ellicott City (HPC-21-38b) – Shoemaker’s/Rosenstock building
- 3) 8109-8111 Main Street, Ellicott City (HPC-21-38c) – the Johnson’s three-story building
- 4) 8113 Main Street, Ellicott City (HPC-21-38d) – the Johnson’s two-story building

The Applicant proposes to salvage the following elements from the buildings:

- 1) 8085 Main Street – salvage remaining wood truss
- 2) 8109-8111, 8113 Main Street – salvage remaining wood truss

The application explains that this project, the proposed partial removal of the above buildings, is referred to as the “Channel Constriction Project.” The application states:

“The *Channel Constriction Project* is located in historic Ellicott City, along the south side of Main Street, between Tiber Alley and Old Columbia Pike. The project includes removing constrictions over the existing stream channel to restore conveyance capacity of the channel; specifically, the back of 8081 8085-8089 Main Street, 8095-8101 Main Street (first floor only), 8109-8111-8113 Main Street, four buildings located over the existing stream channel located in from the 100-year floodplain.”

The application further states the following:

“Generally, the flood mitigation projects work as a system to collectively mitigate flash flooding, incorporating both storm water retention facilities and conveyance system improvements. To be most effectively implemented, significant constrictions in the conveyance system need to be alleviated. The portions of the buildings proposed for removal under this application represent constrictions to the flow of water within the stream channel. Each portion of building proposed for removal currently spans the stream channel – in essence acting as a capacity limit to the flow of water from upstream and out to the Patapsco River. The project seeks to restore conveyance capacity of the stream channels by removing portions of the building from the 100-year floodplain.

The effort to partially remove the buildings, as well as reconstruct new rear facades and return the buildings to service, is fully funded. Construction is slated to start upon receipt of all local, state and federal approvals.”

The Applicant has also submitted an Application for Advisory Comments/Pre-Application Advice for the rear facades that would remain after the partial demolition. The application states:

“For the *Channel Construction Removal* project, the County intends to preserve the facades and front portions of several buildings, while removing their rear portions. It is important to note that this application does not propose any alteration to the façade of the buildings that parallels Main Street. The sections proposed for removal are rear portions span the stream channel, and thus represent a significant constriction to the flow of water. The detrimental effects of this constriction were evident during the July 2016 and May 2018 flood events. The County’s approach maintains portions of these buildings, including their facades, and will convert them to future useable space.

Prior to removal, Howard County will complete recordation and salvage efforts.”

The portions of each building proposed for removal is shown in the LIDAR scans below, in Figures 6, 7 and 8.



Figure 6 - Proposed area of demolition at 8085 Main Street




Figure 7 – Proposed area of demolition at 8095 Main Street




Figure 8 - Proposed area of demolition at 8109-8111 and 8113 Main Street

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations: The following Guidelines, Code provisions, and Rules of Procedure references below are excerpts, and are included for the Commission's consideration in reviewing the application. Please refer to the actual documents for the full text.

Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines; Chapter 12: Demolition and Relocation

- 1) Chapter 12 states, "Demolition and relocation of any structure requires a Certificate of Approval from the Historic Preservation Commission. This requirement applies to structures such as retaining walls, sheds and garages as well as houses. Historic buildings are irreplaceable resources. Because their demolition will have a permanent detrimental effect on the historic district, the Commission will consider approving demolition only after all possible alternatives to preserve the structure are exhausted."
- 2) Chapter 12 states, "For any demolition or relocation, the treatment of the site after the removal of the structure and the new location and site design for a relocated building (if the location is within the historic district must also be approved by the Commission)."

Rules of Procedure, Section 300, Demolition and Relocation of Structures in Historic Districts; General
 Section 300 states, "Demolition or relocation of any structure in an historic district requires a Certificate of Approval. The Certificate of Approval must include a plan for treatment of the site after the structure is removed. The Certificate of Approval must also include the new location for a relocated building if the location is within an historic district in Howard County."

Section 300 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure provide information on the process for reviewing applications for demolitions in the historic district. The entire section is relevant to this application, and is incorporated by reference. Please refer to the Rules of Procedure for full text.

Rules of Procedure, Section 301, Demolition and Relocation of Structures in Historic Districts; Contents of Application

Section 301 of the Rules of Procedure outlines the process and information needed in an application for demolition. Section 301 explains that documentary evidence must be submitted to support the demolition request and outlines the information that should be provided in an application. The Rules of Procedure also state that before the Commission acts on an application for demolition, they shall determine whether the building is a Structure of Unusual Importance, which is defined by Section 302.

Rules of Procedure, Section 302, Demolition and Relocation of Structures in Historic Districts; Classification of Structure

Section 302 states, "Before acting on an application for demolition or relocation, the Commission shall determine whether the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance."

- A. Structures of Unusual Importance are structures deemed by the Commission to be of unusual importance to the Nation, State or County, whose loss would cause great damage to the character and integrity of the historic district.*
- B. Determination that a structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance shall be based on criteria in its adopted guidelines, the testimony of expert witnesses or other documentary evidence presented to the Commission.*

If the Commission determines the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance, the process to be followed is described in Section 303 of the Rules, *Demolition of Structures of Unusual Importance*.

Rules of Procedure, Section 303, Demolition and Relocation of Structures in Historic Districts; Demolition of Structures of Unusual Importance [EXCERPT]

...

B. If the Commission determines the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance, the following applies:

- 1. The Commission may deny the application unless:*
 - a. The structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program which will be of substantial benefit to the County; or*
 - b. Retention of the structure would cause undue financial hardship to the owner; or*
 - c. Retention of the structure would not be in the interest of a majority of the persons in the community.*
- 2. The burden of proof is on the applicant to establish that one of the conditions cited in Rule 303.B.1 applies.*
- 3. If the applicant relies on Rule 303.B.1.b in order to meet the burden of establishing the need for demolition, the applicant must present documentary evidence of the cost of maintaining or relocating the structure, the estimated cost of the demolition, the estimated cost of restoring or stabilizing the building, all other financial information on which the applicant relies to establish financial hardship, and, if the applicant relies on evidence of the lack of structural integrity of the structure, a report on the structural integrity prepared by an engineer licensed in the State of Maryland, based on the engineer's in person observations of the interior and exterior of the structure.*
 - a. Costs that are estimated must be supported by written estimates by persons qualified to provide such estimates and in sufficient detail to*

- permit the Commission to verify the reasonableness of the estimate.*
- b. *The Commission may find that retention of the structure would cause the applicant financial hardship if it determines that the building has been demolished by neglect or natural disaster and there is no feasible way to restore the building short of rebuilding.*

If the Commission determines the structure is not of Unusual Importance, the process to be followed is described in Section 304 of the Rules of Procedure, under *Demolition of Other Structures*. Section 304.A states that if the Commission determines the structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, they shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards in Section 16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines. An excerpt from Section 16.607 is provided below.

Section 16.607 – Standards for Review.

(a) Elements for Consideration. In reviewing an application for a certificate of approval, the Commission shall give consideration to:

- (1) The historic, architectural, or archeological value or significance of the structure and its relationship to historic value of the surrounding area.*
- (2) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure to the remainder of the structure and to the surrounding area.*
- (3) The general compatibility of exterior design, scale, proportion, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.*
- (4) Whether the requested action is necessary to protect against threats to public safety.*
- (5) Any other factors, including aesthetic factors, which the Commission deems to be pertinent.*

Section 16.608 of the County Code contains information on Structures of Unusual Importance. An excerpt is provided below.

Section 16.608(d), Structures of Unusual Importance

- (a) Structure of Unusual Importance. In the case of an application for alteration affecting the exterior appearance of a structure or for the moving or demolition of a structure the preservation of which the Commission deems of unusual importance to the County, State or nation, the Commission shall endeavor to work out with the owner an economically feasible plan for the preservation of such structure.*
- (b) Deny Application. Unless the Commission is satisfied that proposed construction, alteration, or reconstruction will not materially impair the historic value of the structure, the Commission shall deny the application.*
- (c) Negotiation. If an application is submitted for alteration, moving or demolition of a structure that the Commission deems of unusual importance and no economically feasible plan can be formulated, the Commission shall have 90 days from the time it concludes that no economically feasible plan can be formulated to negotiate with the owner and other parties in an effort to find a means of preserving the building.*
- (d) Special Circumstances. The Commission may approve the proposed alteration, moving or demolition of a structure of unusual importance despite the fact that the changes come within the provisions of subsections (a) through (c) of this section, if:*
 - (1) The structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program which will be of substantial benefit to the County;*
 - (2) Retention of the structure would be a threat to public safety;*
 - (3) Retention of the structure would cause undue financial hardship to the owner; or*

- (4) *Retention of the structure would not be in the interest of a majority of the persons in the community.*

Staff Recommendation to the HPC:

- 1) For HPC-21-38a, Staff recommends the HPC determine if the structure located at 8085 Main Street is of Unusual Importance.
 - a. If the Commission determines that the structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, it shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards set forth in §16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines.
 - b. If the Commission determines that the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance, it should follow the procedure laid out in Rule 303.B in the Commission's Rules of Procedures and determine whether proposed partial demolition complies with the Guidelines and §16.607 and §16.608 of the County Code.
 - c. If the Commission approves the application for partial demolition, Staff recommends the HPC confirm if the material proposed to be salvaged is acceptable.
- 2) For HPC-21-38b, Staff recommends the HPC determine if the structure located at 8095 Main Street is of Unusual Importance.
 - a. If the Commission determines that the structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, it shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards set forth in §16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines.
 - b. If the Commission determines that the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance, it should follow the procedure laid out in Rule 303.B in the Commission's Rules of Procedures and determine whether proposed partial demolition complies with the Guidelines and §16.607 and §16.608 of the County Code.
- 3) For HPC-21-38c, Staff recommends the HPC determine if the structure located at 8109-8113 Main Street is of Unusual Importance.
 - a. If the Commission determines that the structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, it shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards set forth in §16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines.
 - b. If the Commission determines that the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance, it should follow the procedure laid out in Rule 303.B in the Commission's Rules of Procedures and determine whether proposed partial demolition complies with the Guidelines and §16.607 and §16.608 of the County Code.
 - c. If the Commission approves the application for partial demolition, Staff recommends the HPC confirm if the material proposed to be salvaged is acceptable.
- 4) For HPC-21-38d, Staff recommends the HPC determine if the structure located at 8113 Main Street is of Unusual Importance.
 - a. If the Commission determines that the structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, it shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards set forth in §16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines.
 - b. If the Commission determines that the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance, it should follow the procedure laid out in Rule 303.B in the Commission's Rules of Procedures and determine whether proposed partial demolition complies with the Guidelines and §16.607 and §16.608 of the County Code.
 - c. If the Commission approves the application for partial demolition, Staff recommends the HPC confirm if the material proposed to be salvaged is acceptable.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Robert Hollenbeck and Sameer Sidh, the Applicant and County Administration representative. Mr. Sidh said he was there tonight in support of the County Administration's application for the rear removal of the buildings. He said this project was a major component of the EC Safe and Sound Plan and that the plan provides a substantial benefit to Howard County as whole, and that the plan advances those interests through seven flood mitigation projects to reduce flood risk. He said the rear removal of the buildings was a critical project for EC Safe and Sound.

Mr. Hollenbeck explained there were two parts to the project they were presenting. The first part of the project was approval for the rear removal of the buildings and the second part was for Advisory Comments on what to put back, as well as the construction of the park.

Mr. Hollenbeck provided an overview of the channel constriction project through a PowerPoint presentation. He said the removal of the portion of the buildings will not have any impact on the Main Street facades, which will remain exactly the same and will not be altered by this request for Certificate of Approval. He showed an aerial map view of the buildings and explained that the maroon portion of the shading represented the rear portions of the buildings they needed to remove. He said they conducted a sediment study in the stream channel and explained the process used to determine if removal of the rear portions was necessary. They wanted to make sure there was no other way to increase capacity without removal of the buildings. He said there was 1 to 3 feet of sediment in the channel, and they determined the slope of the bottom of the stream channel was relatively shallow and that excavating the loose material out did not gain capacity and they could not guarantee how long the excavation would last. As a result, the County proposes to remove the rear portion of the buildings that span the stream channel in order to provide capacity in the stream channel for storm water to safely flow to the Patapsco River.

Mr. Hollenbeck showed an image of the rear of 8125 Main Street when the County acquired the building, where the side of the building was destroyed by the flood and the building was in danger of collapse.

Mr. Hollenbeck said the rear removal will allow the County to restore capacity in the conveyance network and have the room for storm water to remain in the stream channel and improve efficiency in the flow in the network. With Caplan's, water got to a point where it could not rise anymore because there was an obstruction and water backed up and spilled on to the street and increased the peak water surface elevation on the street. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that by keeping water in the stream channel behind the buildings and removing the obstruction, the County can reduce the peak water surface elevation and hydrostatic water force on neighboring buildings.

Mr. Hollenbeck showed a map of the seven EC Safe and Sound Plan, Option 3.G7.0 projects. Mr. Hollenbeck explained the projects are a mix of conveyance, retention and detention projects. He testified that the Channel Constriction Projects is required to allow the safe flow of water to the Maryland Avenue Culvert Project, case HPC-20-83, where it can discharge to the Patapsco River.

Mr. Hollenbeck explained the EC Safe and Sound Plan is a major improvement project of substantial benefit to Ellicott City. Mr. Hollenbeck explained the status of each of the 7 EC Safe and Sound projects.

Mr. Hollenbeck explained the plan development process, which included looking at the previous Administration's plan that included the full removal of the buildings presented in this application. He explained that over 60 scenarios were analyzed before choosing this plan. Mr. Hollenbeck said this plan was reviewed by the Army Corps of Engineers and Army Corps team found the selected plan, the 3G7.0 plan, significantly reduced the flood risk to Ellicott City.

He explained the 3G.7.0 plan seeks to reduce water depths and water velocities to levels where the other buildings can support non-structural floodproofing. He explained how the projects all work together. He said that this project, the Channel Restriction Project, will keep water in the stream channel and convey it through the Maryland Avenue Culvert and out to the Patapsco River. With this project and the other projects in the EC Safe and Sound Plan, they are able to reduce water level to three feet or less and water velocities to 5 feet per second or less in a 2016 flood scenario. He said these are the baselines necessary to support non-structural flood proofing.

He explained the County has been before the Commission several times over the past few years presenting cases for Certificate of Approval or Advisory Comments. Mr. Hollenbeck said the County recently completed a Federal Section 106 process, which involved finding measures to mitigate adverse effects for the demolition of the four lower Main Street buildings, and the HPC participated in that process.

Mr. Hollenbeck gave an overview of each of the buildings, showing current and historical photographs of each. He said they thought 8085 Main Street was constructed circa 1920s/1930s and said it has terracotta construction on the front. He said the 8095 Main Street building was constructed in the late 1990s/early 2000s after the 1999 fire. Mr. Hollenbeck showed a photo of the building at 8109-8113 Main Street which showed how the front façade has change over time.

Mr. Hollenbeck explained the history of 8125 Main Street after the rear structure was removed and explained what was kept on the structure and showed the portion constraining the stream channel that was removed.

Mr. Hollenbeck discussed 8085 Main Street, a 3-story building with a former basement that was infilled with flowable fill so that it no longer contains the basement space. He explained the County proposes to remove the rear two-story portion, which was an addition to the original terra cotta portion (which they propose to retain). Mr. Hollenbeck explained the prior property owner retained the land with the deck across the stream and the County does not own that. Mr. Hollenbeck said the rear section proposed for removal was heavily damaged in 2016 flood. The County believed it was originally supported with three trusses, one was destroyed in 1999 fire, the previous owner said one was destroyed in 2016 flood and the third retained for aesthetics. The portion they propose to remove was constructed from platform framing, which limits their ability to maintain any portion above the stream channel. He explained they have the opportunity to expose views of the former grist mill race, which is not visible right now, but it was a feature they found which they could expose and restore.

Mr. Hollenbeck said that 8095 Main Street was constructed in the late 1990s/early 2000s when the former building destroyed by fire in 1999. He explained they propose only to remove a portion of 1st floor and the 2nd and 3rd floors will remain. Mr. Hollenbeck said the first floor will be usable. Mr. Hollenbeck explained the contemporary construction method of this building, which allows them to retain the upper floors, while removing the rear of the first floor. He said the building was designed for the 100-year floodplain. He said this building was designed for the 100-year floodplain and is a good example of the problem with active floodproofing methods. He explained that the building has a flood door and during the first flood no one knew where it was and during the second flood, it was so heavy that the sole occupant of the building could not move it, so the building took on water. He stressed the importance of getting the water level to the point where active flood proofing is not needed, because it cannot be implemented in the amount of time these types of flood allow.

Mr. Hollenbeck discussed 8109-8113 Main Street. He said DPW proposes to remove rear portion and fully maintain the portion on Main Street. He showed pictures of the rear of the building and explained the building will be retained at the white siding/red roof and the deck and tan board siding/red roof portion would be removed. In 2018 the new highly reinforced structural floor was seriously damaged and the building is compromised. This building has an older wood truss, and they propose to salvage those truss materials for use elsewhere.

Mr. Hollenbeck summarized that each of these buildings will have usable space where people can go in and experience the buildings. Each floorplate will be 20 to 25-feet deep, which is comparable to existing buildings along Main Street.

Mr. Hollenbeck discussed the Section 106 programmatic agreement, which he said was recently executed. He said it prescribes measures the County is required to follow, such as measure to minimize and mitigate adverse effects. He mentioned the project has performance standards like recordation, and DPW has done complete laser scans of the buildings, developed full architectural drawings and had the County Architectural Historian through the buildings. They will also be updating historic nomination forms. The County will salvage components and has engaged a qualified historic preservation architect. He said the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement prescribes that the County needs to reuse salvaged materials, first on these 6 buildings, then elsewhere in the district or within the greater County.

Mr. Hollenbeck offered that the building at 8095 is not historic and they do not find it has any unusual importance. He said they are maintaining its unique typology over the channel.

Mr. Hollenbeck discussed the project timeline and said they are currently working through design process for rear removals. The rear facades are to be discussed on the Advisory application, and then they will come back for a Certificate of Approval. He said they have concepts for St. Paul Street Park, which will be shown later tonight and said they have funding from an FY 2022 bond bill that would be available in 2023.

Mr. Hollenbeck asked the Commission if they wanted him to proceed with Advisory portion of the application or discuss the rear demolitions.

Public Testimony

Mr. Shad opened up the meeting for testimony and said they wait for the Advisory Comments. He swore in Ms. Liz Walsh, who registered in opposition to the project. She said that she did not want to cross examine, only make a statement. Ms. Walsh said the demolition reflects on decades of failure. Ms. Walsh asked the Commission to consider imposing the same conditions that were imposed on the prior request for demolition, which is the Applicant does not destroy anything that is not explicitly the subject of this application and that the Applicant comply with and obtain all other government agency approvals and conditions before demolition is allowed. Ms. Walsh also requested a new condition, which she previously asked the Army Corps of engineers to apply after the first consulting parties meeting. She asks that in any location where demolition must proceed and is approved to place the land and space above it into perpetual conservation easement so that no new habitable structure would be permitted again in those locations to impose upon the floodplains or span the waterways. They should remain in perpetuity in the public domain.

Mr. Shad swore in Grace Kubofcik. Ms. Kubofcik thanked DPW, Mr. Hollenbeck and his staff for the detailed write up of the properties and photos. She agreed that DPW will have to take off the back of the buildings off, but it is for a public purpose for water to flow through the stream channel. Ms. Kubofcik was excited that Mr. Hollenbeck found the mill race, which no one knew existed. She

appreciated the clear connections to the EC Safe and Sound project and that Mr. Hollenbeck was following the guidelines of the Section 106 process. Ms. Kubofcik urged the Commission to proceed with the recommendation of the demolitions of the backs of the buildings.

Mr. Shad swore in Kathy Younkin, Chair of the Heritage Committee of Patapsco Heritage Greenway (PHG). Ms. Younkin read a statement in favor of approval. She said that a long term prominent goal of PHG is historic preservation, they support the effort to remove less visible parts of the Main Street buildings, to allow water to flow without constriction.

Commission's Questions

Mr. Reich asked about the possibility of the easements that Ms. Walsh mentioned, so that if the land is sold in the future there is no construction across the stream channel 100 years from now. He asked if there has been any discussion on easements.

Mr. Hollenbeck said they received Ms. Walsh's comment through the Section 106 process and explained that the Section 106 agreement says they must develop in accord with Ellicott City Watershed Master Plan and there are no policies that prescribe building structures, so they did not find it necessary to look into easements. Mr. Hollenbeck said the Master Plan was adopted by County Council and set a clear policy. Mr. Hollenbeck said the County does not allow new construction within the 100-year floodplain, so someone could not get building permits.

Mr. Reich asked the status of the Section 106 approvals. Mr. Hollenbeck said the agreement was recently executed by all signatory parties. The Army Corps and Maryland Department of the Environment were reviewing final documentation for issuing permitting. Mr. Reich asked if those approvals were all that were necessary aside from County approvals. Mr. Hollenbeck said they needed approval from Maryland Historical Trust as well and said they have received this same packet.

Mr. Reich asked about funding. Mr. Hollenbeck said they have received a \$5 million Strategic Demolition Fund grant from the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development. Mr. Reich asked if that was enough to complete the project and Mr. Hollenbeck said it was enough to complete the demolition and new rear facades.

Mr. Reich said the rear channel was a concern the last time. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that as demolition proceeds, it will be done in manner that does not deposit material into the channel. He explained how the stonework was done at the rear of Caplan's and said they would take the same approach. He showed photo of rear that showed infilled beam pockets. Mr. Reich asked if it was the same plan for the other buildings. Mr. Hollenbeck said they would use the same approach, and rebuild in-kind using salvaged or new stone.

Mr. Reich and Mr. Hollenbeck discussed the proposed park on the other side of the stream and the project timeline for completion. Mr. Hollenbeck they would start rear removals in the early part of 2022, which would take approximately 6 months and then put rear facades in concurrently with rear removal.

Ms. Zoren asked Mr. Hollenbeck to explain relationship of the Commission giving approval for demolition, Advisory Comments and the subsequent approval of rear façades. She wanted to know how the timeline ties together. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that DPW would propose, if there was a time lag, that the demolition drawings include provisions for a temporary weathertight enclosure at the rear of the buildings to bridge the gap between that and final façade treatment.

Ms. Danna asked what protections will be in place to ensure the stream will not be built over again. She asked if the lot lines will be redrawn. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that the lot lines have not been firmly surveyed or documented since the 1800s. He explained that currently each property has some land on the other side of the channel and DPW has not thought about how to combine it in a future arrangement.

Ms. Danna asked if the rear facades will be structurally reinforced like Caplan's if the water rises above the channel wall height. Mr. Hollenbeck said yes, the rear facades will be designed to keep water in stream channel so it can flow to the Maryland Avenue Culvert Project and said they are looking at resilient materials for the rear facades of the building.

Ms. Danna asked if there will be a monitor during the removal of the rear of the buildings. Mr. Hollenbeck said the interior of the building at 8085 has been gutted and the only thing on the inside of any significance is the truss element. He said that 8111-81113 is in a similar state, is only down to studs and there is nothing notable inside. He said they will have construction oversight, someone there daily, overseen by him or a colleague to ensure contractor is proceeding in accordance with the construction documents.

Ms. Danna inquired about the plans that show the interior walls of 8111-81113 being demolished. Mr. Hollenbeck said the current interior is built out for apartments and the County does not intend to restore the building to residential occupancy. He explained that per the EC Safe and Sound Plan, they want to control occupancy so that in a flood watch/warning, they can force buildings to be vacated, which they cannot do in a residential setting.

Ms. Flynn Giles said that many of her questions had been answered. She was concerned about protection of stream and buildings, and the Section 106 process. She expressed concern about reconstruction in places where the buildings have been removed. Mr. Hollenbeck said there were no plans for new construction and that the project would be done in accordance with the policies in the Watershed Master Plan, as adopted by the Council. He said they are working through the lot lines to make sure they fully understand them before they progress the plans on the south side of the stream to the next level. He said they are doing archival research back to the 1800s.

Mr. Thacker thanked the Applicant for the thorough study and information made available to him. He said he tried to bring himself up to speed with the Watershed Master Plan and understand the mitigation. His said understanding was that this area is being turned into a culvert to allow for additional flow in the event of another flood similar to 2016 and 2018. Mr. Thacker asked if there was a back-up system since channel is not being made wider or deeper, in the case of another flood event. Mr. Hollenbeck explained they are not proposing to excavate or widen channel and are keeping the existing channel walls. He explained that removing the rear of the buildings allows for water to rise in height within the channel, rather than spill out into Main Street. Mr. Hollenbeck said that reinforcing the rear of the buildings, like Caplan's, will help to keep water in the stream channel. Mr. Hollenbeck said the EC Safe and Sound projects are a system of a whole and all work together; all projects are required to be in place to function and achieve the end goals of a reduction of less than 3 feet of flood water and 5 feet per second or less velocities.

Mr. Shad did not have any questions, but requested a copy of the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement that was just signed. Mr. Hollenbeck agreed.

Deliberation

The Commission began deliberation to determine if the buildings at 8085, 8095, 8109-8111 and 8113 Main Street were of Unusual Importance, the partial rear demolitions and various conditions to be added on for approval.

Testimony

Ms. Zoren requested a contingency that demolition not begin until they have approved rear elevations so they have a guarantee that the rear will be constructed appropriately. Ms. Shad also found that request reasonable and thought they would see actual approvals before the end of the year. Mr. Shad asked Mr. Hollenbeck when they would see the applications for approval. Mr. Hollenbeck said their request would be to move forward with the rear demolition prior to having those Certificate of Approvals in place. Mr. Hollenbeck explained they will have a lot of hand demolition work that will need to take place, which will take an extended period of time. Mr. Reich asked that the temporary rears would look like and Mr. Hollenbeck stated that the rear first floor façade of 8125 Main Street is an example, but it could also be painted plywood to be weather tight. Mr. Reich and Mr. Hollenbeck discussed the rear of 8125 Main Street and the details of the white block white. Mr. Hollenbeck said the Advisory Application will show two alternate treatments to be put over the structural block wall. Mr. Hollenbeck explained they are requesting to put a temporary plywood façade on the rear of the buildings, but are hoping not to have to do that.

Ms. Flynn Giles and Mr. Hollenbeck discussed the proposed timeline and Mr. Hollenbeck said they hoped to put the permanent rear façade back on concurrently with the demolition, but it depends on the timing with the final design documents and approvals. Ms. Flynn Giles confirmed that the idea is that the back walls would be a short term, temporary, solution and there is always the intention to put back on permanent walls that comply with the Advisory recommendations. Mr. Hollenbeck said the temporary wall does not achieve the goal of keeping water in the stream channel and they intend to put a reinforced wall that keeps the water in the channel and then clad it.

Ms. Danna asked if the rear facades were intended to be CMU blocks long term or a variety of materials. Mr. Hollenbeck said the first floor structures would be some form of concrete blocks. He explained that a concern with the concurrent rear façade construction is the strain on material supply chain due to the pandemic. He said that if he ordered materials tonight, it might be 4 months before he received a delivery date and the siding and windows have 12-16 week lead times. He said their goal is to put the rear facades back as quickly as possible and there was no benefit to delaying as they have the funding in place right now.

Ms. Danna asked if the Section 106 process called for a monitor in the deconstruction. She said that she would like to see a historic preservation trained monitor on the site for a significant portion of the day while the demolition goes on. Mr. Shad agreed that could be a condition. Mr. Hollenbeck said the Section 106 does not have a clause to allow continual monitoring during the work, but requires other types of reporting. Mr. Hollenbeck suggested allowing DPW to hire a trained or independent construction contractor. Mr. Hollenbeck said that have qualified preservationist on their design team and he could have them do weekly site visits or confer with inspector on a regular basis. Mr. Reich asked if County personnel would be on the construction site. Mr. Hollenbeck explained how DPW's large scale construction projects operated with once a week site visits, at times daily, depending upon the project. Mr. Hollenbeck said the cost of bringing a preservation architect to the site would be onerous, but they accept a condition to have a County employee or construction inspector contracted directly to the County. The Commissions thought that was reasonable. Ms. Zoren recommend a preservation mark items that are off limits/do not touch so that it is clear what should remain.

Mr. Thacker asked if periodic inspections through the project timeline could be established. Mr. Hollenbeck said they could engage the preservation architect to provide period site visits. Mr. Hollenbeck said that a pre-demolition walk through is also something would be ordinarily do. Ms. Flynn Giles recommended the preservation consultant have pre-demolition review and regular reviews in accordance with the construction schedule, so that it is documented, and in the schedule.

The Commission made the following motions:

1) HPC-21-38a – 8085 Main Street (Portalli's)

Unusual Importance

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to find the building at 8085 Main Street was a Structure of Unusual Importance. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

2) HPC-21-38b – 8095 Main Street (Shoemaker)

Unusual Importance

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to find the building at 8095 Main Street was not a Structure of Unusual Importance. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

3) HPC-21-38c – 8109-8111 Main Street (Johnsons Buildings)

Unusual Importance

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to find the building at 8109-8111 Main Street was a Structure of Unusual Importance. Mr. Thacker seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

4) HPC-21-38d – 8113 Main Street (Johnsons buildings)

Unusual Importance

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to find the building at 8113 Main Street was a structure of Unusual Importance. Ms. Danna seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

5) Demolition – 8085 Main Street

Motion: Based on 16.608(d)(1) and (2), Ms. Zoren moved that the demolition proposed on the rear portions of the building spanning the river channel is going to be beneficial because that portion of the structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program; it would benefit the County and Ellicott City historic district and retention of that portion of the structure could be considered a threat to public safety because it constricts the stream channel and further damage could make the building unsound and unretainable. Mr. Reich seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved

6) Demolition – 8109-8111 Main Street

Motion: Ms. Flynn Giles moved to apply to same rational to 8109-8111 Main Street and approve the partial demolition, in accord with Section 16.608(d)(1) and (2), with conditions to be added. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

7) Demolition – 8113 Main Street

Motion: Ms. Flynn Giles moved to approve the partial demolition of the rear of 8113 Main Street, in accordance with Section 16.608(d)(1) and (2) with conditions to be added. Ms. Danna seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

8) Demolition – 8095 Main Street

Motion: Ms. Flynn Giles moved to approve the partial demolition of the rear of 8095 Main Street in accordance with Section 16.607(a)(4) and (5), with conditions to be added. Ms. Danna seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

9) Conditions for Demolition Approvals

Motion: Mr. Reich moved that conditions be added on the demolition approvals. The conditions are as follows:

- 1) No demolition proceed without all of the necessary approvals being in place first.
- 2) The channel walls be repaired or reconstructed to match the adjacent stone in the channel.
- 3) Historic artifacts involved in the demolition, such as the mill race and historic trusses be preserved.
- 4) The County provide a preservationist from DPW to preview the demolition work and provide regularly scheduled reports during the work.
- 5) That the County take all reasonable precautions that no part of the historic buildings that are part of the demolition, or adjacent to, are damaged in the course of demolition.

Ms. Danna seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-21-39 – 8081 Main Street, 8085 Main Street, 8095 Main Street, 8109-8111 Main Street, 8113 Main Street and 8125 Main Street, 3760 St. Paul Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Robert Z. Hollenbeck, Howard County Department of Public Works

Request: The Applicant, Robert Z. Hollenbeck, AIA, on behalf of the Howard County Department of Public Works, requests Advisory Comments on the rear façade reconstruction and improvements at 8081 Main Street, 8085 Main Street, 8109-8111 Main Street, 8113 Main Street and 8125 Main Street.

Background and Site Description: These properties are all located in the Ellicott City Historic District (HO-78). The buildings have the following dates of construction and alteration:

1. **8081 Main Street** – The building dates circa 1834-38. The property is listed as HO-360, Boone House, in the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory and the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties.
 - a. The previously existing addition had smoke and water damage from the 1999 fire and demolished. In September 2000, in case HPC-00-47, the HPC approved the construction of new two-story rear addition with a cantilevered deck.
2. **8085 Main Street** – According to SDAT the building on the property dates the building to 1920.
 - a. The building was significantly damaged in the 1999 fire, 2016 flood and 2018 flood.
3. **8095 Main Street** – The historic building was destroyed in the 1999 fire and demolished, the current building constructed in 2000.
4. **8109-8111 Main Street** – The building at 8109-8111 Main Street dates circa 1860 and is shown on the Sanborn maps by 1887. The property is listed as HO-586, Katydid, in the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory and the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties.
 - a. Photographic evidence shows the front façade has been altered significantly over time.
 - b. The building was damaged in the 1999 fire and sustained significant interior and exterior damage in the 2016 and 2018 floods.
5. **8113 Main Street** – The building dates circa 1830s. The property is listed as HO-359, Crosscurrents/Caplan's Frame Shop, in the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory and the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties.
 - a. Photographic evidence shows the front façade has been altered significantly over time.
 - b. The building was damaged in the 1999 fire and sustained significant interior and exterior damage in the 2016 and 2018 floods.
6. **8125 Main Street** – According to articles from the Ellicott City Times, the building was constructed in 1926 and was designed by architect Stanislaus Russell of Baltimore.
 - a. The building was significantly damaged in the 2016 and 2018 floods. In May 2019, in case HPC-19-18, the rear portion of the building over the stream was demolished and the building was stabilized.
7. **3760 St. Paul Street** – Two garages were approved for demolition in August 2016 in case HPC-16-52, following the 2016 flood in order to obtain access to the rear of 8125 Main Street. The sloped space remaining is now known at 3760 St. Paul Street.

The Staff Report Addendums for the previous case, HPC-21-38 is incorporated by reference.

Scope of Work: The Applicant seeks Advisory Comments on the rear façade treatments of the buildings at 8081 Main Street, 8085 Main Street, 8095 Main Street, 8109-8111 Main Street, 8113 Main Street and 8125 Main Street, as well as the creation of a park at 3760 St. Paul Street, Ellicott City. The application provides an excerpt from the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement and states, "The proposed rear removals are not intended to alter the existing stream channel walls. Where the channel walls require repair, this will be executed as part of the project.

- a) Stone will be selected to match existing to the greatest extent possible.

- b) Stone will be laid in a pattern consistent with adjacent materials.
- c) Mortar samples will be collected and examined to determine a mix compatible with the adjacent material.”

The application explains the proposed rear façade treatment specific to each building:

- 1) **8081 Main Street** – The application states, “The rear façade of the building visible was constructed c. 1990s and is clad with German-lap wood siding, a material common and highly prevalent in the Historic District. As flood proofing approaches are considered, the first floor fenestration must be altered to alleviate potential water infiltration points. The rear addition that was constructed in the 1990s is appropriately scaled to the original structure. The addition also allows the original structure to read independently. The approach for this structure is to maintain the shape and form of the c. 1990s addition, to restructure the rear addition using flood resilient materials with no visible change to the exterior siding or shape / form of the building. Alternative fenestration is planned for the face of the building paralleling the stream channel, on the First Floor only. Windows will be located at a higher elevation, and will be awning or casement function, single light design. Since the German lap siding may be exposed to rising water, replacing it with a composite material, such as fiber cement, would maintain the look but provide additional flood resilience.”



Figure 9 - Rear 8081 Main Street

- 2) **8085 Main Street** – The application states, “The portion of the building being preserved was constructed from terra cotta masonry, which was prevalent during the time period. While the Main Street façade appears to be larger scale brick masonry units, it is actually terra cotta. To emulate this approach, cladding the rear façade with larger scale brick masonry units is proposed. The design team is considering a Utility size brick, nominally 4 inches by 12 inches, as the closest readily-available option; however additional material research is ongoing. The use of punched window openings, scaled slightly smaller than the front façade, is proposed for the new rear façade. The windows will be wood, or aluminum-clad wood should the Commission consider it (for ease of long-term maintenance).”



Figure 10 - Rear of 8085/Portalli's in 2012, prior to construction of rear deck and bar.

- 3) **8095 Main Street** – The application states, “8095 presents a unique opportunity to improve a relatively contemporary structure into a focal point spanning the stream channel, visible from new expanded park space along Lower Main Street and St. Paul Street. This structure will become one that will be experienced from all facades. Given that the building is only approximately 20 years old, and that the side and rear facades have no distinguishing features, two approaches have been developed for this structure.

The first approach is generally responsive to the illustrative vision of the Master Plan, and consistent with other masonry structures throughout the Historic District. This approach proposes a series of punched window openings, and considers the logic of similar ‘side’ facades, most notably the side of 8059 Main Street. In order to improve the energy efficiency, and provide additional visual interest, a new cladding for the side and rear facades is proposed. This cladding respects and channels the prevalence of horizontal siding present throughout the District, but augments that by proposing a larger scale and slightly more contemporary detailing. This approach could utilize fiber composite panels that are painted, or potentially include the use of a rain-screen system, utilizing aluminum composite panels.

The second approach includes developing more contemporary window openings, elongated and responsive to the building shape and form. Along the east side of the building, a glass curtain wall system is proposed on the portion of the building spanning the stream channel. This affords a unique opportunity to view and experience the stream channel from inside the structure – a concept harmonious with the Commission’s guidelines. It also potentially allows for salvaged truss components to potentially be displayed interior to the building, but be visible through the curtain wall system. With the contemporary approach, considerations for alternative cladding approaches are contained within Appendix A.”



Figure 11 - Aerial view of 8095 Main Street

- 4) **8109-8111, 8113 Main Street** – The application states, “The portion of the building being removed is an addition to the original structure. On the second and third floors of the building, German-lap wood siding is visible, as are several sliding doors and windows that do not appear to relate to the Main Street façade of the building. Building upon the materials already present, the new rear façade is proposed to be clad in similar German-lap wood siding. New windows are proposed, following the logic of the Main Street façade. It is envisioned that with the reduced floor plate, most, if not all interior walls will be removed, hence one would be able to experience both façades while inside the building. The new windows would be either wood double-hung or aluminum-clad wood, should the Commission allow it, for ease of maintenance.”



Figure 12 - Rear of 8109-8111, 8113 Main Street

- 5) **8125 Main Street** – The application states, “Recently, DPW completed removal of the rear portion of the building that was in danger of collapse. During this process, DPW was able to maintain the far south brick wall, on the south side of the stream channel, as well as components of the original building structure which span the stream channel. Given that the new construction on the First Floor was not originally the rear of the building, which differs from 8085 or 8111-8113, two approaches are presented. The first approach is to install a composite ‘board and baton’ type siding, generally with a 12” exposure and nominally 3” batons. The siding would extend from the top of the existing stream channel wall, to the underside of the 2nd story, above; and be painted in a color complementary to the existing brick above. The board and baton look was selected to provide a visual break from the prevalence of horizontal siding on either side of the building; and also since the length of the building is longer than buildings typically present in the area.

A second approach would be to install brick masonry, complementary to the existing brick visible on the 2nd floor, on the lower level as well. With either option, clerestory windows are proposed for installation. The placement was developed in response to the 3-bay rhythm of the front façade.”



Figure 13 - Rear of 8125 Main Street.

- 6) **3760 St. Paul Street** – The Applicant proposes to create a pocket park at 3760 St. Paul Street (former rear of 8125 Main Street). The parcel is located along St. Paul Street, across the stream from Main Street. The Applicant proposes to incorporate flood egress to this parcel from the Main Street buildings. There is currently a pressure treated wood boardwalk/walkway from the rear of 8125 Main Street to St. Paul Street (which is not ADA accessible). In creating a pocket park, the Applicant proposes to demolish the existing wood boardwalk/walkway and construct an ADA accessible ramp within the proposed park area.

The application shows two options for the park, Option A and Option B (please note the application correction: Page 52 and 53 in the ‘Channel Constriction Project Rear Removals’ states Options 1 and 2 but will be referenced as Options A and B throughout this staff report. On page 47, the designs are noted as Approach A and Approach B, also referencing Options A and B.) Both options provide ADA ramp accessibility, seating areas and green space. Option A incorporates a seating area parallel to the stream channel. Option B utilizes the footprint of the former carriage house at the entry point of the ramp. Option B includes a lawn space and larger seating area by the stream channel.



Figure 14 - Previously existing garages.



Figure 15 - Looking at park area from St. Paul Street



Figure 16 - Pressure treated walkway and view of proposed park area.



Figure 17 - View looking toward foundation ruins and St. Paul Street

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations: The following Guidelines and Code provision referenced below are excerpts, and are included for the Commission's consideration in reviewing the application. Please refer to the actual documents for the full text.

Chapter 6.C: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Masonry

- 1) Chapter 6.C recommends:
 - a. *"Maintain or restore original brick, stone, concrete block or stucco. Make repairs with materials that match the original as closely as possible."*
 - b. *"If a masonry wall or feature must be replaced, use material as similar to the original as possible, particularly if the materials are visible from a public road or are key elements of the building's style or character."*
- 2) Chapter 6.C states the following is a possible exception: *"When historic masonry must be replaced, it may be necessary to use modern materials if historically accurate materials cannot reasonably be used for economic or other reasons. The materials chosen should be as compatible as possible with the original."*

Chapter 6.D: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Wood Siding, Shingles and Logs

- 3) Chapter 6.D states, *"Wood is the most common building material in Ellicott City. German siding and wood shingles are found on many buildings; clapboard siding is also found but is less common."*
- 4) Chapter 6.D recommends, *"When necessary, replace deteriorated wood siding or shingles with wood siding or shingles that match the original as closely as possible in width, shape, and profile. Maintain the original shape and width of details such as cornerboards, cornices, and door and window trim."*
- 5) Chapter 6.D states the following are possible exceptions:
 - a. *"If wood siding must be replaced on a historic building, a composite siding material may be considered, if wood is not a viable option, the composite siding conveys the appearance of the historic material. and application of the substitute material does not damage or obscure historic features. The texture, width, shape, profile and finish of the substitute siding material should be similar to the wood siding it replaces."*
 - b. *"Especially on non historic buildings, vinyl or aluminum siding may be replaced with a similar material, preferably one that is an improvement over the existing material in appearance. (Replacement with a matching material is routine maintenance)."*

The rears of these buildings are not highly visible from St. Paul Street due to the topography, and are not visible from Main Street.

In HPC-17-52, the Commission approved the use of Boral TruExterior siding (a composite poly ash product) in a German lap profile, to be used on the side of 8085 Main Street, (the side of the building located directly over the stream). The Boral TruExterior website states that the siding "installs with standard woodwork tools and methods, accepts paint of any color, resists rot and termite attacks, maintains a high level of dimensional stability and does not crack or split from moisture." There are also other composite/fiber cement products available in a German lap siding, whereas in years past the siding profiles offered were mostly a plain lap siding.



Figure 18 – Older wood siding (left) compared to Boral siding (right)

Chapter 6.H: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Windows

- 6) Chapter 6.H provides background information on the common types of windows found in Ellicott City.
- 7) Chapter 6.H states, “Vinyl or metal replacement windows do not have the same detailing as wood windows and should be avoided on historic buildings. Although they are usually appropriate on modern buildings, vinyl windows can be detrimental to a historic streetscape if used on a prominent, highly visible façade of a nonhistoric building close to historic buildings. Wood windows clad with a permanent finish are a good, low maintenance alternative.”
- 8) Chapter 6.H states the following is a possible exception, “Vinyl windows may be acceptable for modern additions to historic buildings if the addition is to the rear of the building with little visibility from public ways or neighboring properties.”

While primarily recommending the repair of historic windows, the Guidelines offer recommendations for other scenarios. The new rear facades will not be historic and all proposed window openings will be new. The Commission has previously approved aluminum clad wood windows on historic properties, and the Guidelines indicate the use of aluminum clad wood windows on the new rear facades would be acceptable.

Chapter 7: New Construction: Additions, Porches and Outbuildings

- 9) Chapter 7 states:
 - a. “Design additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new. Additions may be contemporary in design or may reference design motifs from the historic building, but should not directly imitate the historic building.”
 - b. “Design windows to be similar in size, proportion and arrangement to the existing windows. On historic buildings, or any building visible from a public way, windows should have true divided lights rather than interior or sandwiched muntins. A possible alternative is windows that do not have divided lights but have permanent exterior grilles, appropriately detailed to be compatible with historic wood windows.”
 - c. “On any building, use exterior materials and colors (including roof, walls and foundations) similar to or compatible with the texture and color of those on the existing building. Avoid exact replication that would make an addition appear to be an original part of a historic building.”
 - d. “For frame construction, use wood siding or wood shingles similar in appearance to the siding or shingles on the existing building. Aluminum, vinyl or another substitute siding may be acceptable if already used on the existing building. A substitute siding material that is compatible in width, profile, shape, texture and finish to the wood siding on the

existing building may be used for additions to nonhistoric buildings, or for additions to historic buildings if wood siding is not a viable option.”

While the Applicant is not proposing to construct an addition, the proposed construction of a new rear façade is comparable, and the Guidelines offer recommendations to distinguish the historic structure from the new construction.

Section 16.607 – Standards for Review.

(a) Elements for Consideration. In reviewing an application for a certificate of approval, the Commission shall give consideration to:

- (1) The historic, architectural, or archeological value or significance of the structure and its relationship to historic value of the surrounding area.*
- (2) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure to the remainder of the structure and to the surrounding area.*
- (3) The general compatibility of exterior design, scale, proportion, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.*
- (4) Whether the requested action is necessary to protect against threats to public safety.*
- (5) Any other factors, including aesthetic factors, which the Commission deems to be pertinent.*

Chapter 9.A: Landscape and Site Elements; Topography and Water Courses

10) Chapter 9.A states:

- a. *“Ellicott City's natural setting is essential to its character. In projects that involve grading land, clearing vegetation or building new structures, care should be taken to protect and enhance natural features, views of important natural features, and the environmental setting of historic buildings.”*
- b. *“Steep, rocky slopes form the backdrop for much of the historic district. Ellicott City's buildings and streets were fitted into the steep hillsides without major changes to the natural land forms. Retaining walls or the outer walls of buildings have been used to terrace the land to create the narrow, level areas needed for buildings, roads, gardens and other improvements.”*

11) Chapter 9.A recommends:

- a. *“Minimize grading by siting new structures and other improvements to make use of the land's natural contours. When necessary, use appropriately designed retaining walls or building walls to create the minimum level area needed for a new use in accordance with historic development patterns.”*
- b. *Maintain and reinforce natural landscape elements, such as rock outcroppings, water courses and tree lines. Make views of natural elements, especially the Patapsco River and its tributaries, available to the public where possible. Provide walkways, sitting areas and casual stopping spots in parks, plazas, and other areas open to the public.”*

Chapter 9.D: Landscape and Site Elements; Walls, Fences, Terraces, Walkways and Driveways

12) Chapter 9.D recommends:

- a. *“Identify and retain site features that are important to the historic character of a site.”*
- b. *“Preserve historic features, such as retaining walls, freestanding walls, fences, terraces, walkways, driveways and steps. When possible, reuse the historic building 'materials to repair or restore these structures.”*
- c. *“Construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.”*

- d. *“Install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal. Use closed wood fences only for side and rear yards in areas where a precedent exists. Construct closed wood fences of painted vertical boards, with straight or angled rather than scalloped tops.”*
- e. *“Construct new terraces or patios visible from a public way from brick, stone or concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone.”*

The proposal to construct a pocket park complies with the Guideline recommendations. Other applicable Guideline recommendations related to the construction of a park are referenced above for the Commission’s consideration.

Newspaper articles about the 1999 fire indicated that the lack of rear access to the buildings along Main Street was a significant impediment to containing the fire. If possible, any incorporation of hydrants and emergency access (such as level surfaces where possible) would be beneficial.

Alternate arrangement of the ramp switchbacks and terracing could allow for more usable parkland, which could include incorporation of picnic tables, terracing, benches and usable lawn. This would allow more gathering space during emergency events and more space for passive recreational opportunities.




Figure 19 – Example of terracing and stonework at Falls Park on the Reedy, Greenville, SC, Google Streetview 2014

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC provide Advisory Comments on the rear treatments of the building and the creation of a pocket park based on the standards set forth in §16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines.

Testimony: There was no testimony as this case was continued to the November 4, 2021 HPC meeting.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Commission Administrative Business

a. Welcoming new members

The existing Commission and new members introduced themselves.

b. Voting for officers

Mr. Shad said he was willing to serve as the Chair for the remainder of his term, which ends in July. Mr. Reich moved to make Mr. Shad the Chair. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Reich nominated Ms. Zoren to serve as Vice-Chair. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Zoren nominated Mr. Reich to serve as Secretary. Ms. Flynn Giles seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

c. Training session information

Staff said they will be setting up a training opportunity in January and were looking at January 13, 2022.

Mr. Shad moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:39 pm. Ms. Flynn Giles seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

S. Allan Shad, Chair

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner